

Atom-molecule coherence in a one-dimensional system

R. Citro

*Dipartimento di Fisica “E. R. Caianiello” and Unità I.N.F.M. di Salerno
Università degli Studi di Salerno, Via S. Allende, I-84081 Baronissi (Sa), Italy*

E. Orignac

*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de l'École Normale Supérieure CNRS-UMR8549
24, Rue Lhomond F-75231 Paris Cedex 05 France*

We study a model of one-dimensional fermionic atoms with a narrow Feshbach resonance that allows them to bind in pairs to form bosonic molecules. We show that at low energy, a coherence develops between the molecule and fermion Luttinger liquids. At the same time, a gap opens in the spin excitation spectrum. The coherence implies that the order parameters for the molecular Bose-Einstein Condensation and the atomic BCS pairing become identical. Moreover, both bosonic and fermionic charge density wave correlations decay exponentially, in contrast with a usual Luttinger liquid. We exhibit a Luther-Emery point where the systems can be described in terms of noninteracting pseudofermions. At this point, we provide closed form expressions for the density-density response functions.

Recent experiments on fermionic ^6Li or ^{40}K atoms in optical traps have led to the realization of paired superfluidity. Pairs of atoms were found to bind into bosonic molecules that displayed a Bose-Einstein condensation[1, 2, 3, 4] as the magnetic field was varied across a Feshbach resonance. The Bose condensation of the molecules is expected to trigger superfluidity of the fermions. A crossover is thus expected from a BCS superfluid of paired atoms to a Bose Einstein condensate (BEC) of molecules as the molecules become more tightly bound. It is important to stress that since the BEC and the BCS states have the same broken symmetry, there is no fundamental distinction between them, and these two extreme limits are connected by a smooth crossover. This crossover is naturally described by the fermion-boson model which has extensively been considered in the context of bipolaronic and high-Tc superconductivity[5] and has recently known a regain of theoretical interest [6, 7, 8, 9].

Recently, the BCS-BEC crossover has been investigated in the one-dimensional case[10, 11, 12]. Despite the absence of broken symmetries in one dimension, a rich phenomenology is known to emerge such as collectivization of single-particle degrees of freedom, spin-charge separation and quasi-long range order[13]. In particular, spin-1/2 fermions with attractive interactions give rise to a state with gapless charge degrees of freedom and gapped spin degrees of freedom, with quasi-long range superconducting and charge density wave order, known as the Luther-Emery liquid[13]. In [11, 12], an integrable model[14] of spin-1/2 fermions with attractive interactions was considered. It was shown that the Luther-Emery liquid obtained at small attraction was crossing over to a Luttinger liquid of tightly bound bosonic molecules. In [10], the boson-fermion model was used, but the case of a broad resonance where only the bosons or only the fermions are present was considered, yielding

results similar to those of the integrable model. An interesting theoretical question is to understand what happens in the case of a narrow Feshbach resonance when the atoms and the molecules can coexist. In the present Letter, we investigate such a case. We show that a strongly correlated state exists in this case, in which the order parameters of the Bose condensation and superfluidity decay with the same critical exponent, and density fluctuations near the Fermi wavevector are strongly suppressed. Also, a spectral gap is present in the atomic spectral function, as in the case of a Luther-Emery liquid. From the experimental point of view, the interest in working in one dimension is the possibility of using the confinement induced resonance (CIR) [15] to form the molecules, as recently demonstrated[16]. Another way of forming the molecules is by photoassociation techniques[17]. Since it is possible to realize quasi-1d systems of bosons and fermions in optical traps[18], some of our predictions could be testable in experiments.

We consider a 1D system of fermionic atoms that can bind reversibly into bosonic molecules. In the continuum case, the Hamiltonian of the system reads:

$$H = - \int dx \sum_{\sigma} \psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger} \frac{\nabla^2}{2m_f} \psi_{\sigma} - \int dx \psi_b^{\dagger} \left(\frac{\nabla^2}{4m_f} - \nu \right) \psi_b + \lambda \int dx (\psi_b^{\dagger} \psi_{\uparrow} \psi_{\downarrow} + \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \psi_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \psi_b) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\nu, \nu' = b, f} \int dx dx' V_{\nu\nu'}(x - x') \rho_{\nu}(x) \rho_{\nu'}(x') \quad (1)$$

where ψ_{σ} annihilates a fermion (atom) of spin σ , ψ_b annihilates a boson (molecule), $\rho_b = \psi_b^{\dagger} \psi_b$, $\rho_f = \sum_{\sigma} \psi_{\sigma}^{\dagger} \psi_{\sigma}$, and we have set $\hbar = 1$. The parameters V_{ff} , V_{bb} and V_{bf} measure (respectively) the fermion-fermion, boson-boson, and fermion-boson repulsion. The parameter ν is the detuning, and the term λ describes the binding of pair of atoms into a molecule and the reverse process.

When $\lambda \neq 0$, only the total atom number $\mathcal{N} = 2N_b + N_f$ is conserved. The fermion-boson model (1) can be analyzed by bosonization techniques in the limit of a narrow resonance (i.e. small λ) and provided that neither the density of atoms nor the density of molecules vanishes.

First, we recall the bosonized description of the system when boson-fermion interactions are turned off. For $\lambda = 0, V_{bf} = 0$, both the number of free atoms N_f and the number of molecules N_b are conserved and the Hamiltonian equivalent to (1) is given by[13]:

$$H = H_b + H_\rho + H_\sigma - \frac{2g_{1\perp}}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int dx \cos \sqrt{8}\phi_\sigma \quad (2)$$

$$H_\nu = \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} \left[u_\nu K_\nu (\pi \Pi_\nu)^2 + \frac{u_\nu}{K_\nu} (\partial_x \phi_\nu)^2 \right] \quad (3)$$

where $[\phi_\nu(x), \Pi_{\nu'}(x')] = i\delta(x-x')\delta_{\nu,\nu'}$, ($\nu, \nu' = b, \sigma, \rho$). The parameters u_ρ, u_σ, u_b are the velocity of respectively atomic density, atomic spin, and molecular density excitations. K_ρ and K_b are the Luttinger exponents[13]. They decrease as (respectively) the atom-atom and molecule-molecule repulsion increase. For weak repulsion, it is possible to express K_ρ as a function of the scattering length a_s , trapping frequency $\omega_\perp$ and the Fermi velocity of non-interacting atoms as $K_\rho = (1 + 2a_s\omega_\perp/\pi v_F)^{-1/2}$. In the case of bosons, the Luttinger exponent K_b must be extracted from the Lieb-Liniger equations[13, 19]. For weak interaction, $K_b \rightarrow +\infty$, while in the Tonks-Girardeau limit, $K_b = 1$. Turning to the spin interaction, it is known[13] that under the renormalization group (RG) $g_{1\perp}$ and K_σ flow to the fixed point $K_\sigma^* = 1, g_{1\perp}^* = 0$ provided that the repulsive interactions respect the SU(2) spin symmetry. We will thus replace $K_\sigma, g_{1\perp}$ by their fixed point value in the following. The power of bosonization in treating interacting systems in one-dimension comes from the possibility of expressing the fermion and boson annihilation operators in terms of the fields in (2) as:

$$\psi_{r,\sigma}(x) = \frac{e^{\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}[\theta_\rho - r\phi_\rho + \sigma(\theta_\sigma - r\phi_\sigma)](x)}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}}, \quad (4)$$

$$\Psi_b(x) = \frac{e^{i\theta_b}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} [1 + A \cos(2\phi_b - 2k_B x)], \quad (5)$$

where the dual fields[13] $\theta_\nu(x) = \pi \int^x \Pi_\nu(x') dx'$ ($\nu = b, \rho, \sigma$) have been introduced, $k_F = \pi N_f/L$, $k_B = \pi N_b/L$, $r = \pm$, and α is a cutoff. The atom field is expressed in terms of the right and left moving fields of Eq. (4) as: $\psi_\sigma(x) = e^{ik_F x} \psi_{+,\sigma} + e^{-ik_F x} \psi_{-,\sigma}$. Similarly, the atom and molecule density are given by[13]:

$$\rho_f(x) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \partial_x \phi_\rho + \frac{\cos(2k_F x - \sqrt{2}\phi_\rho)}{\pi\alpha} \cos \sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma \quad (6)$$

$$\rho_b(x) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \partial_x \phi_b + \frac{\cos(2k_B x - 2\phi_b)}{\pi\alpha}. \quad (7)$$

Let us now turn on $\lambda, V_{bf}, \nu \neq 0$, assuming that that they are small compared with the kinetic energy of

the atoms and the molecules. This corresponds to the limit of a narrow Feshbach resonance[10]. For $k_B \neq k_F$, the boson-fermion repulsion reduces to a term $\sim \frac{V\sqrt{2}}{\pi^2} \int \partial_x \phi_b \partial_x \phi_\rho$ [20]. Using Eqs. (4)-(5) The bosonized form of the λ is:

$$H_{bf} = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2\pi^3\alpha}} \int dx \cos(\theta_b - \sqrt{2}\theta_\rho) \cos \sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma \quad (8)$$

Finally, the detuning term reads: $-\frac{\nu}{\pi} \int dx \partial_x \phi_b$, which shows that it can be eliminated by a shift of $\phi_b \rightarrow \phi_b - 2\frac{\nu x K_b}{u_b}$, without affecting Eq. (8). Thus, the detuning is effective only when it induces band-filling transitions at which either the density of atoms ($\nu < 0$) or of molecules ($\nu > 0$) vanishes. At these transitions, the bosonization description breaks down, with divergence of the compressibility.[21] The large detuning limit has been analyzed in [10], where it was shown that existence of virtual atom or molecule states only leads to a renormalization of the Luttinger exponent K_b or K_ρ respectively. In the following, we take $\nu = 0$. The RG equation for λ reads:

$$\frac{d\lambda}{d\ell} = \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2K_\rho} - \frac{1}{4K_b} \right) \lambda, \quad (9)$$

showing that for $\frac{1}{2K_\rho} - \frac{1}{4K_b} < 3/2$, this interaction is relevant. Since for hard core bosons[22] $K_b = 1$ and for free bosons $K_b = \infty$ while for free fermions $K_\rho = 1$, this inequality is satisfied except for very strongly repulsive interactions V_{ff} and V_{bb} . In this strong repulsion limit, there is no coherence between atoms and molecules and the system is described by the theory of [20]. For less repulsive interactions, the relevance of λ drives the system to a new fixed point. To understand the nature of this fixed point, it is convenient to perform a canonical transformation[13] $\theta_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\theta_b - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}}\theta_\rho$, $\theta_+ = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}}\theta_b + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\theta_\rho$ and the same transformation for the ϕ_ν . Then, $H_b + H_\rho$ becomes $H_\pm$ with:

$$H_\pm = \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} \sum_{\nu=\pm} \left[u_\nu K_\nu (\pi \Pi_\nu)^2 + \frac{u_\nu}{K_\nu} (\partial_x \phi_\nu)^2 \right] + \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} [g_1 (\pi \Pi_+) (\pi \Pi_-) + g_2 \partial_x \phi_+ \partial_x \phi_-], \quad (10)$$

where $u_\pm, K_\pm, g_{1,2}$ can be obtained in terms of the parameters of the original Hamiltonian and V_{bf} . In the following, we will assume $u_\pm = u_\sigma = u$. When we express (8) in terms of θ_- , we see that when λ is relevant, only the fields ϕ_σ and θ_- are locked, with a gap $\Delta_- = \Delta_\sigma \sim u/\alpha(\lambda\alpha/u)^{4/(6-2K_\rho^{-1}-K_b^{-1})}$, while ϕ_+ remains gapless. The field ϕ_+ describes the total density excitations of the system, as can be seen from the relation $\sqrt{6}[\phi_+(\infty) - \phi_+(-\infty)] = \mathcal{N}$. It is described by the low-energy Hamiltonian:

$$H_+ = \int \frac{dx}{2\pi} \left[u_*^* K_+^* (\pi \Pi_+)^2 + \frac{u_*^*}{K_+^*} (\partial_x \phi_+)^2 \right], \quad (11)$$

where u_+^*, K_+^* are renormalized values of u_+, K_+ , resulting from the residual interactions with the gapped mode θ_- caused by the terms g_1, g_2 . The gapful excitations are formed by kinks of the fields θ_- and ϕ_σ such that $\theta_-(\infty) - \theta_-(-\infty) = \pm\pi/\sqrt{3}$ and $\phi_{\sigma_+}(\infty) - \phi_{\sigma_-}(-\infty) = \pm\pi/\sqrt{2}$. As a result, they carry a spin $\pm 1/2$ and create a phase difference of $\mp\pi$ between bosons and fermions. Thus, they can be identified with half-vortices carrying a spin $1/2$. Having understood the spectrum of the system, let us turn to its ground state correlations. The locking of the fields θ_- and ϕ_σ yields from Eq. (5) the following low energy expression for the BEC order parameter for the molecules: $\Psi_B(x) \sim e^{i\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\theta_+}$, while the order parameter for s-wave BCS superfluidity of the fermions becomes: $\psi_\uparrow\psi_\downarrow \sim e^{i\sqrt{2}\theta_\rho} \cos \sqrt{2}\phi_\sigma \sim e^{i\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\theta_+}$. Thus, these two order parameters become *identical* in the low energy limit as in the case of higher dimensionality.[8, 9]. The boson correlator behaves as: $\langle \Psi_B^\dagger(x, \tau) \Psi_B(0, 0) \rangle = ((x^2 + u^2\tau^2)/\alpha^2)^{-\frac{1}{6K_+}}$, yielding a molecule momentum distribution $n_B(k) \sim |k|^{1/(3K_+)-1}$. This momentum distribution could be measured in a condensate expansion experiment[23, 24]. A more striking consequence of the locking θ_- is that both the $\pm 2k_B$ and the $\pm 2k_F$ harmonic in (respectively) $\rho_b(x)$ and $\rho_F(x)$ acquire exponentially decaying correlations, with a correlation length $\sim u/\Delta_-$. The origin of this exponential decay is that both ρ_b and ρ_f depend on the field ϕ_- dual to θ_- [13]. Such behavior is in contrast with the behavior of a Luttinger liquid of molecules, or a Luther Emery liquid of fermions with attractive interaction, in which these correlation functions

would decay as power law.

A more detailed picture of the gapful spectrum and the correlation functions can be obtained at a particular solvable point of the parameter space, the so called Luther-Emery point[25]. For $K_- = 3/2$, one can introduce the pseudofermion fields:

$$\Psi_{r,\sigma} = \frac{e^{i[(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_- - r\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\theta_-) + \sigma(\theta_\sigma - r\phi_\sigma)]}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}}, \quad (12)$$

to rewrite Eq. (8) and $H_- + H_\sigma$ as a free pseudofermions Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_\sigma \int dx \left[-iu \sum_{r=\pm} r \Psi_{r,\sigma}^\dagger \partial_x \Psi_{r,\sigma} + \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{8\pi}} \Psi_{r,\sigma}^\dagger \Psi_{r,\sigma} \right] \quad (13)$$

At that point, the kinks are pseudofermions with dispersion $\epsilon(k) = \pm\sqrt{(uk)^2 + \Delta^2}$, where $\Delta = \frac{|\lambda|}{\sqrt{8\pi}}$. In terms of the pseudofermions the fermion density reads: $\rho_{2k_F,f}(x) = e^{i[\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_+ - 2k_F x]} (\Psi_{-, \uparrow}^\dagger \Psi_{+, \downarrow}^\dagger + \Psi_{+, \uparrow}^\dagger \Psi_{-, \downarrow}^\dagger) + \text{H. c.}$ which yields an expression of density-density correlations correlation in terms of modified Bessel functions. The boson density is expressed in terms of order and disorder operators of four 2D non critical Ising models[26] as: $\rho_b(x) \sim e^{i(\sqrt{8/3}\phi_+ - 2k_B x)} (\mu_{1,\uparrow}\sigma_{2,\uparrow} + i\sigma_{1,\uparrow}\mu_{2,\uparrow})(\mu_{1,\downarrow}\sigma_{2,\downarrow} + i\sigma_{1,\downarrow}\mu_{2,\downarrow}) + \text{H. c.}$ where $\sigma(\mu)$ are the order (disorder) parameters of the Ising model. The correlation functions of the non-critical Ising model are obtained from [27]. The Fourier transform of the Matsubara correlation functions then reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\rho\rho}^B(\pm 2k_B + q, \omega) &= \frac{2\pi}{u} \left(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{u}\right)^{\frac{4K_+}{3}} \left(\frac{\Delta}{u}\right)^2 \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{2K_+}{3}\right)^3}{4\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{2K_+}{3}\right)} {}_3F_2\left(1 - \frac{2K_+}{3}, 1 - \frac{2K_+}{3}, 1 - \frac{2K_+}{3}; \frac{3}{2} - \frac{2K_+}{3}, 1; -\frac{\omega^2 + (uq)^2}{4\Delta^2}\right) \\ \chi_{\rho\rho}^F(\pm 2k_F + q, \omega) &= \frac{1}{2\pi u} \left(\frac{\Delta\alpha}{u}\right)^{\frac{K_+}{3}} \left[\frac{\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{K_+}{6}\right)^3}{\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{K_+}{6}\right)} {}_3F_2\left(1 - \frac{K_+}{6}, 1 - \frac{K_+}{6}, 1 - \frac{K_+}{6}; \frac{3}{2} - \frac{K_+}{6}, 1; -\frac{\omega^2 + (uq)^2}{4\Delta^2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\Gamma\left(2 - \frac{K_+}{6}\right)\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{K_+}{6}\right)\Gamma\left(-\frac{K_+}{6}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{K_+}{6}\right)} {}_3F_2\left(2 - \frac{K_+}{6}, 1 - \frac{K_+}{6}, -\frac{K_+}{6}; \frac{3}{2} - \frac{K_+}{6}, 1; -\frac{\omega^2 + (uq)^2}{4\Delta^2}\right) \right], \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

and the response functions are then obtained by the substitution $i\omega \rightarrow \omega + i0$. Since the generalized hypergeometric functions ${}_{p+1}F_p(\dots; \dots; z)$ are analytic for $|z| < 1$ [28], the imaginary part of the response functions vanishes if $\omega < 2\Delta$. For $\omega > 2\Delta$, the behavior of the imaginary part is given by the expression[29] of the imaginary part of ${}_3F_2$ in terms of Appell's hyperge-

ometric function[28] F_3 , yielding power law singularities at $\omega = 2\Delta$ with an exponent $K_+/3 - 1/2$ for the atoms and $4K_+/3 - 1/2$ for the molecules. The Luther-Emery limit also yields the $q \simeq 0$ components of the density response. Noticing that $\rho_B = \partial_x \phi_+/\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{2}\partial_x \phi_-/\sqrt{3}$, we find that $\Im \chi_{\rho\rho}^B(q, \omega)$ is the sum of a term $\propto \delta(\omega \pm u_+ q)$ coming from the gapless phase mode, and a term $\propto$

$(\omega - 2\Delta - (uq)^2/(4\Delta^2))^{-1/2}\Theta(\omega - 2\Delta - (uq)^2/(4\Delta^2))$ coming from the gapped mode. The same result holds for $\Im\chi_{\rho\rho}^F(q, \omega)$. Most interestingly, the cross correlations of the fermion and the boson density are also non-vanishing for $q \rightarrow 0$ and behave similarly to $\chi_{\rho\rho}^B(q, \omega)$. The imaginary parts of correlation functions Eq. (14)–(15) can be measured by Bragg spectroscopy with large momentum transfer[30] and the $q = 0$ component can be measured by Bragg spectroscopy with small momentum transfer[31, 32, 33]. The atom Green's function is obtained using form factor expansion techniques [34, 35] as:

$$G(x, \tau) \sim e^{i\varphi} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{1}{12}(K_+ + \frac{1}{K_+})} K_{\frac{5}{6}}\left(\frac{\Delta}{v}\rho\right) + O(e^{-3M\rho/v}) \quad (16)$$

where $\rho = \sqrt{x^2 + v^2\tau^2}$. The corresponding spectral function is obtained by Fourier transformation[35], and it vanishes below the gap Δ , as in a superfluid[36]. It would be interesting to observe this gap in a condensate expansion experiment[23, 24]. We have seen that with a narrow resonance, the mutual coherence of the atoms and the molecules reinforces the superfluidity of the system. An important question to ask is how such a coherence can be lost. A first way of losing the coherence is by applying a temperature, creating a density of half-vortices $\sim e^{-\Delta\sigma/T}$, which destroys phase coherence between the atoms and molecules on a lengthscale $\ell(T) \sim e^{\Delta\sigma/T}$. The second way of losing the coherence between bosons and fermions is by applying a magnetic field strong enough to cancel the gap for the creation of half-vortices excitations, causing a commensurate incommensurate transition.[37] As a result of this transition, power law singularities in the density-density correlations reappear, and the behavior of the system is again described by the models of Refs. [20]. From the experimental point of view, a narrow resonance could be obtained by working with ^6Li atoms[4] trapped in a two dimensional optical lattice. The relevant parameters[4] for ^6Li are the mass $m(^6\text{Li})=9.96 \times 10^{-27}$ kg, the width of the resonance $\Delta B = 0.23\text{G} = 2.3 \times 10^{-5}$ T, the atom-atom scattering length $a_{bg}=80 a_0 = 4.23 \times 10^{-9}$ m, the difference in magnetic moment between the atom and the molecule, $\Delta\mu \sim 2\mu_B=2 \times 927.400949 \times 10^{-26} = 1.8 \times 10^{-23}$ J.T $^{-1}$, and the trapping frequencies $\omega_{\perp}=2\pi \times 69\text{kHz}$, $\omega_z = \omega_{\perp}/270$. With these parameters we find that the Fermi velocity is of the order 10^{-2} m/s and the value of the Luttinger parameter is $K_{\rho} \sim 0.995$. Finally we would like to comment on the fact we have only considered the case of the continuum system (1). All the considerations above apply equally to a lattice model at an incommensurate filling, albeit the effective mass of the atoms and the molecules can be strongly enhanced by the periodic potential. For commensurate filling in the lattice system, an umklapp term, $H_{umk.} = \frac{2gv}{(2\pi\alpha)^2} \int dx \cos \sqrt{24}\phi_+$ is present in the Hamiltonian and can create a Mott gap[13]. The RG treatment shows that the Mott gap exists only for

$K_+ < 1/3$ i.e. very strong repulsion. In the Mott insulating state, superfluid and BEC correlations become short ranged as the density density correlations.

Note added: The model considered in the present paper has also been studied independently by D. E. Sheehy and L. Radzihovsky[38]. The CSG phase discussed by these authors is identical to the one discussed in the present paper, and the condition for stability of the CSG phase derived by them is also compatible with the one derived in this paper.

-
- [1] S. Jochim, M. Bartenstein, A. Altmeyer, G. Hendl, S. Riedl, C. Chin, J. Hecker Denschlag and R. Grimm, *Science* **302**, 2101 (2003).
 - [2] M. Greiner, C. A. Regal, and D. S. Jin, *Nature* **426**, 537 (2003).
 - [3] M. W. Zwierlein, C. A. Stan, C. H. Schunck, S. M. F. Raupach, S. Gupta, Z. Hadzibabic, and W. Ketterle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 250401 (2003).
 - [4] K. E. Strecker, G. B. Partridge, and R. G. Hulet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 080406 (2003).
 - [5] A. S. Alexandrov and J. Ranninger, *Phys. Rev. B* **23**, 1796 (1981); R. Friedberg and T. D. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 6745 (1989).
 - [6] E. Timmermans, K. Furuya, P. W. Milonni, and A. K. Kerman, *Phys. Lett. A* **285**, 228 (2001).
 - [7] M. Holland, S. J. J. M. F. Kokkelmans, M. L. Chiofalo, and R. Walser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 120406 (2001).
 - [8] Y. Ohashi and A. Griffin, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 033603 (2003).
 - [9] Y. Ohashi and A. Griffin, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 063612 (2003).
 - [10] J. Fuchs, A. Recati, and W. Zwerger, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 033630 (2005).
 - [11] J. Fuchs, A. Recati, and W. Zwerger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 090408 (2004).
 - [12] I. V. Tokatly, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 090405 (2004).
 - [13] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in one Dimension*, volume 121 of *International series of monographs on physics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2004.
 - [14] M. Gaudin, *Phys. Lett. A* **24**, 55 (1967); C. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19**, 1312 (1967).
 - [15] M. Olshanii, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 938 (1998); V. A. Yurovsky, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 012709 (2005).
 - [16] H. Moritz, T. Stöferle, K. Günter, M. Köhl, and T. Esslinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 210401 (2005).
 - [17] M. Mackie, E. Timmermans, R. Cote, and J. M. Javanainen, *Opt. Express* **8**, 118 (2001).
 - [18] D. Petrov, D. Gangardt, and G. Shlyapnikov, *J. Phys. IV* **116**, 3 (2004).
 - [19] E. H. Lieb and W. Liniger, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 1605 (1963).
 - [20] M. A. Cazalilla and A. F. Ho, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 150403 (2003); L. Mathey, D.-W. Wang, W. Hofstetter, M. D. Lukin, and E. Demler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 120404 (2004).
 - [21] D. C. Cabra and J. E. Drut, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **15**, 1445 (2003).
 - [22] T. D. Schultz, *J. Math. Phys.* **4**, 666 (1963).
 - [23] F. Gerbier, A. Widera, S. Fölling, O. Mandel, T. Gericke,

- and I. Bloch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 050404 (2005).
- [24] E. Altman, E. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 013603 (2004).
 - [25] A. Luther and V. J. Emery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 589 (1974).
 - [26] A. Luther and I. Peschel, Phys. Rev. B **12**, 3906 (1975).
 - [27] T. Wu, B. McCoy, C. Tracy, and E. Barouch, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 1976 (1976).
 - [28] A. Erdélyi, W. Magnus, F. Oberhettinger, and F. G. Tricomi, *Higher transcendental functions*, volume 1, McGraw-Hill, NY, 1953.
 - [29] P. Olsson, J. Math. Phys. **7**, 702 (1966).
 - [30] J. Stenger et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4569 (1999), Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2283(E) (2000).
 - [31] D. M. Stamper-Kurn et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2876 (1999).
 - [32] F. Zambelli, L. Pitaevskii, D. M. Stamper-Kurn, and S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 063608 (2000).
 - [33] J. Steinhauer, R. Ozeri, N. Katz, and N. Davidson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 120407 (2002).
 - [34] S. Lukyanov and A. B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B **607**, 437 (2001).
 - [35] A. M. Tsvelik and F. H. L. Essler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 126401 (2003).
 - [36] A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gorkov, and I. E. Dzyaloshinski, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics*, Dover, New York, 1963.
 - [37] G. I. Japaridze and A. A. Nersesyan, JETP Lett. **27**, 334 (1978); V. L. Pokrovsky and A. L. Talapov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 65 (1979).
 - [38] D. E. Sheehy and L. Radzihovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 130402 (2005).